arXiv:1606.05976v2 [math.AP] 15 Aug 2016

Solution to the Pompeiu problem and the related symmetry problem

A. G. Ramm
Mathematics Department
Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506, USA
email: ramm@math.ksu.edu

Abstract

Assume that $D \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is a bounded domain with C^1-smooth boundary. Our result is:

Theorem 1. *If D has $P-$property, then D is a ball.*

Four equivalent formulations of the Pompeiu problem are discussed.

A domain D has $P-$property if there exists an $f \neq 0$, $f \in L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ such that $\int_D f(gx+y)dx = 0$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and all $g \in SO(2)$, where $SO(2)$ is the rotation group.

The result obtained concerning the related symmetry problem is:

Theorem 2. *If $(\nabla^2 + k^2)u = 0$ in D, $u|_S = 1$, $u_N|_S = 0$, and $k > 0$ is a constant, then D is a ball.*

Key words: The Pompeiu problem; Fourier transforms of characteristic sets; over-determined boundary value problems; symmetry problems.
MSC[2010]: 35J25; 35J05

1 Introduction

The modern formulation of the Pompeiu problem can be given in several equivalent ways. The history of this problem goes back to 1929, see [2]. Brief historical remarks are at the end of our paper. Some known results and references about this problem can be found in [9], Chapter 11, [7], [10], [11], [12]. Our bibliography is incomplete. Our paper is essentially self-contained.

We assume throughout that $D \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ is a bounded domain and its boundary S is C^1-smooth. It is known that under the assumptions of any of the **Formulations 1-4**, stated below, the boundary S is real-analytic, see [11].

By χ the characteristic function of D and by $\tilde{\chi}(\xi) := \int_D e^{i\xi\cdot x}dx$ its Fourier transform are denoted, respectively. The vector $\xi = k\alpha$, where $k > 0$ is the length of ξ, $\alpha \in S^2$ is a unit vector in $\mathbb{R}^3$, S^2 is a unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^3$, and $\xi \cdot x = (\xi, x)$ is the dot product in $\mathbb{R}^3$, $[\xi, x]$ is the cross product.

One of the modern formulations of the Pompeiu problem is the following ([9], [10]):

Formulation 1. *Assume that $f \in L^1_{loc}$, $f \not\equiv 0$, and*

$$\int_D f(y + gx)dx = 0, \quad \forall y \in \mathbb{R}^3, \quad \forall g, \tag{1}$$

where g is an arbitrary rotation. Prove that D is a ball.

Formulation 2. *Prove that if*

$$\tilde{\chi}(k\alpha) = 0 \tag{2}$$

for all $\alpha \in S^2$ and a fixed number $k > 0$, then D is a ball.

Let us give other equivalent formulations of the Pompeiu problem. Denote by N the unit normal to S pointing out of D.

Formulation 3. *Suppose that $k > 0$ is fixed and the following problem*

$$(\nabla^2 + k^2)u = c \quad in \quad D, \quad u|_S = u_N|_S = 0, \quad c = const \neq 0, \tag{3}$$

has a solution. Prove that D is a ball.

Without loss of generality one may assume that the constant c in (3) equals to 1. We assume this below.

Clearly, **Formulation 3** is equivalent to the following symmetry problem, related to the Pompeiu problem:

Formulation 4. *Suppose that $k > 0$ is fixed and the following problem*

$$(\nabla^2 + k^2)u = 0 \quad in \quad D, \quad u|_S = const \neq 0, \quad u_N|_S = 0, \tag{4}$$

has a solution. Prove that then D is a ball.

Formulation 4 gives a symmetry problem that has been unsolved for decades.

If, as we assumed above, the constant $c = 1$ in **Formulation 3** then the *const* in **Formulation 4** equals to $-k^{-2}$.

Formulation 3 with $c = 1$ and **Formulation 4** are equivalent. To prove this, just make in (3) the substitution $u = v + k^{-2}$.

The equivalence of **Formulations 1, 2, 3 and 4** is proved below, see also [9], Chapter 11, and [10]. In our proof **1** stands for **Formulation 1**, etc.

Proof of the equivalence of Formulations 1, 2, 3, 4:

2 $\Rightarrow$ **3**. If an entire function of exponential type $\tilde{\chi}(\xi)$ vanishes on the irreducible algebraic variety $\xi^2 = k^2$, then the function $\tilde{u} := \tilde{\chi}(\xi)(\xi^2 - k^2)^{-1}$ is also entire and of the same exponential type. Its Fourier transform $u(x)$ solves problem (3). The function u is defined in all of $\mathbb{R}^3$, $u \in H^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^3)$ and is compactly supported by the Paley-Wiener theorem. Therefore, by the unique continuation theorem, $u = 0$ in $D' := \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus D$. This and the embedding theorem imply the boundary conditions in **Formulation 3**. $\square$

3 $\Rightarrow$ **2**. If (3) holds, then multiply (3) by $e^{ik\alpha\cdot x}$, $\alpha \in S^2$ is arbitrary, integrate over D, and then by parts, using the boundary conditions (3) and the equation $(\nabla^2 + k^2)e^{ik\alpha\cdot x} = 0$. This yields (2). $\square$

1 $\Rightarrow$ **2**. Take the Fourier transform (in the distributional sense) of (1) and get $\overline{\tilde{\chi}(g^{-1}\xi)}\tilde{f}(\xi) = 0$ for all g, where the over-line stands for complex conjugate. Therefore, $supp\tilde{f} = \cup_k C_k$, where

$$C_k := \{\xi : \xi^2 = k^2, \tilde{\chi}|_{\xi^2=k^2} = 0\}, \quad k > 0,$$

and the set $\{k\}$ is a discrete set of positive numbers since $\tilde{\chi}$ is an entire function. Thus, there is a $k > 0$ such that (2) holds. $\square$

3 $\Rightarrow$ **1**. If (3) holds, then one extends u to $\mathbb{R}^3$ by setting $u = 0$ in D', and takes Fourier transform of this u assuming $c = 1$. This yields $\tilde{u}(\xi)(k^2 - \xi^2) = \tilde{\chi}(\xi)$. Let $\tilde{f} \neq 0$ be supported on $C_k := \{\xi : \xi^2 = k^2, \tilde{\chi}|_{\xi^2=k^2} = 0\}$, where $k > 0$ is a number. Then, $\overline{\tilde{\chi}(g^{-1}\xi)}\tilde{f}(\xi) = 0$ for any rotation g. Taking the inverse Fourier transform of this relation yields (1). $\square$

From the above relations it follows that **1** $\Longleftrightarrow$ **2** $\Longleftrightarrow$ **3**. $\square$
We have already proved that **3** $\Longleftrightarrow$ **4**. $\square$
Thus, **Formulations 1, 2, 3, 4** are equivalent:
1 $\Longleftrightarrow$ **2** $\Longleftrightarrow$ **3** $\Longleftrightarrow$ **4**. $\square$

Because **Formulation 1** is equivalent to **Formulations 2, 3** and **4** the following Theorems 1, 2 and 4 will be established if Theorem 3 is proved.

Theorem 1. *If (1) holds, then D is a ball.*

Theorem 2. *If (2) holds, then D is a ball.*

Theorem 3. *If (3) holds, then D is a ball.*

Theorem 4. *If (4) holds, then D is a ball.*

In Section 2 we prove Theorem 3 and, therefore, Theorems 1, 2 and 4.

2 Proof of Theorem 3.

If equation (3) holds, then one derives the following equations (see also [9], p. 415, [8]):

$$[s, N] = \sum_{j=1}^{J} c_j u_{jN}(s), \qquad \forall s \in S, \quad c_j = const, \tag{5}$$

where c_j are constant vectors, $[s, N]$ is the cross product, u_j are solutions to

$$(\nabla^2 + k^2)u_j = 0, \qquad u_j|_S = 0, \qquad 1 \leq j \leq J, \tag{6}$$

and the system $\{u_j\}_{j=1}^{J}$ is maximal linearly independent set of solutions to (6) normalized in $L^2(D)$.

We prove formula (5) at the end of the paper, see Theorem 6.

Theorem 5. *If (5)-(6) hold and S is real-analytic, then $c_j = 0$, $1 \leq j \leq J$, so $[s, N] = 0$ for all $s \in S$. Therefore S is a sphere centered at the origin.*

Proof. If the origin O of the coordinate system is moved to a position, described by vector a, then $s \to s + a$, $N \to N$, $u_{jN} \to u_{jN}$ and $[s, N] \to [s, N] + [a, N]$. The coefficients $c_j \to c_j(a)$, where c_j and $c_j(a)$ do not depend on s and c_j do not depend on a. Write equation (5) with $s + a$, take into account that $N(s)$ and $u_{jN}(s)$ do not depend on a. This equation is valid for any a:

$$[s + a, N(s)] = \sum_{j=1}^{J} c_j(a) u_{jN}(s). \tag{7}$$

Subtract from the equation (7) equation (5) and get

$$[a, N(s)] = \sum_{j=1}^{J} b_j u_{jN}(s), \qquad b_j := c_j(a) - c_j. \tag{8}$$

Let us prove that the vectors $b_j = 0$, $1 \leq j \leq J$. Note that $c_j(a)$ depends on a but does not depend on s, and c_j does not depend on a or on s. Take an arbitrary unit vector q. Denote $B_j := q \cdot b_j$. Let $p = [q, a]$ and N_p be the projection of N onto p. Scalar multiply (8) by q and get:

$$N_p(s) = \sum_{j=1}^{J} B_j u_{jN}(s), \qquad B_j := q \cdot b_j. \tag{9}$$

Choose a closed curve $\mathcal{L} \in S$ such that $N_p(s)|_{\mathcal{L}} = 0$. Existence of such a curve is clear geometrically: this curve consists of the points s of S which belong to the straight lines tangent to S and parallel to p. Assume that one can choose J points $s_m \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $det(u_{jN}(s_m)) \neq 0$. In Lemma 3 it is proved that this determinant is not equal to 0 for almost all $s_m \in S$ and is an analytic function of s_m on S. Since q is an arbitrary unit vector, p has an arbitrary direction orthogonal to a. Therefore, one may assume that $det(u_{jN}(s_m)) \neq 0$, because a slight change of q allows one to slightly move $\mathcal{L}$. So, if on every $\mathcal{L}$ the determinant is equal to zero for all s_m, then this determinant is equal to zero on a set of positive measure on S. This contradicts the conclusion of Lemma 3. Thus, it follows that there exist J points $s_m \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $det(u_{jN}(s_m)) \neq 0$. Therefore, equation (9) with $s = s_m$, $1 \leq m \leq J$, implies that all $B_j = 0$. Since q is arbitrary, equation $B_j = 0$ implies that $b_j = c_j(a) - c_j = 0$.

Since $c_j(a) = c_j$, equation (7) can be rewritten as

$$[s + a, N(s)] = \sum_{j=1}^{J} c_j u_{jN}(s), \tag{10}$$

where c_j do not depend on a, so the right side of this equation is bounded as $a \to \infty$. Consequently, if not all c_j are equal to zero one has a contradiction, since the left side of equation (10) grows (for some s) as $a \to \infty$ while its right side is bounded as $a \to \infty$. If all $c_j = 0$, then equation (10) yields the relation $[s + a, N(s)] = 0$ on S. This relation implies that $[s, N(s)] = 0$ on S and $[a, N(s)] = 0$ on S. If $[s, N(s)] = 0$ on S, then S is a sphere by Lemma 1, see below. If $[a, N(s)] = 0$ on S, then $a = 0$ since a does not depend on s and $N(s)$ depends on s. If $a = 0$ then the sphere S has its center at the origin.

Theorem 5 is proved. □

Lemma 1. ([9], p. 336) *If S is a smooth closed surface in $\mathbb{R}^3$ such that $[s, N] = 0$ for all $s \in S$, then S is a sphere.*

Proof. Let $s = s(p,q)$ be a parametric equation of S. Then the normal N is proportional to $[s_p, s_q]$, so

$$0 = [s,[s_p,s_q]] = s_p s \cdot s_q - s_q s \cdot s_p. \tag{11}$$

Vectors s_p and s_q are linearly independent at regular points of S. Since S is analytic all its points are regular. Therefore, equation (11) implies that $s \cdot s_q = 0$ and $s \cdot s_p = 0$. Consequently, $s \cdot s = const$. This means that S is a sphere. Lemma 1 is proved. □

Lemma 2. *If equations (6) hold and the system $\{u_j(x)\}_{j=1}^J$ is linearly independent in $L^2(D)$, then the system $\{u_{jN}(s)\}_{j=1}^J$ is linearly independent in $L^2(S)$.*

Proof. Suppose the contrary. Then there are constants h_j, not all vanishing, such that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{J} h_j u_{jN}(s) = 0, \qquad \forall s \in S. \tag{12}$$

Define $w := \sum_{j=1}^J h_j u_j(x)$. Then w solves equation (3) and $w = w_N = 0$ on S. By the uniqueness of the solution to the Cauchy problem for equation (3) it follows that $w = 0$ in D. Since the set $\{u_j(x)\}_{j=1}^J$ is linearly independent in $L^2(D)$, one gets $h_j = 0$, $1 \le j \le J$. Lemma 2 is proved. □

Lemma 3. *If the set $\{u_{jN}(s)\}_{j=1}^J$ is linearly independent in $L^2(S)$ and S is analytic, then $det\,(u_{jN}(s_m)) \neq 0$ for almost all $s_m \in S$, $1 \le m \le J$.*

Proof. In Lemma 3 the variables s_m, $1 \le m \le J$, are independent. We prove that for each s_m the determinant $det\,(u_{jN}(s_m)) \neq 0$ for almost all $s_m \in S$, $1 \le m \le J$. Suppose the contrary, that is, $det\,(u_{jN}(s_m)) = 0$ on a set $\Delta \subset S$ of positive surface measure on S for $s_m \in \Delta$, $1 \le m \le J$. Then, by analyticity of S and by the resulting analyticity of each of the elements $u_{jN}(s_m)$ for $s_m \in S$, one gets:

$$det\,(u_{jN}(s_m)) = 0, \qquad \forall s_m \in S, \quad 1 \le m \le J. \tag{13}$$

Denote $s_1 = s$. If (13) holds, then, expanding the determinant (13) over the elements of the first row and denoting by A_j the determinant corresponding in this expansion to the element $u_{jN}(s)$, one gets:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{J} (-1)^{j+1} u_{jN}(s) A_j = 0, \qquad \forall s \in S, \tag{14}$$

where the determinants A_j do not depend on s. Since the set $\{u_{jN}(s)\}_{j=1}^J$ is linearly independent in $L^2(S)$, it follows that $A_j = 0$, $1 \leq j \leq J$. This implies that the column $\{u_{jN}(s)\}|_{j=1}^J$ is a linear combination of other columns. Therefore, the system $\{u_{jN}(s)\}_{j=1}^J$ is linearly dependent in $L^2(S)$, contrary to the result of Lemma 2. This contradiction proves Lemma 3. □

Theorem 5 and, therefore, Theorem 3 are proved. □

Let us now prove formula (5).

Theorem 6. *Formula (5) holds.*

Proof. Let u solve problem (3) and let U be an arbitrary solution to the equation $(\nabla^2 + k^2)U = 0$ in the ball $B_a := \{x : |x| \leq a\}$, $D \subset B_a$. Multiply (3) by U, integrate over D and use the boundary conditions (3) to get $\int_D U(x)dx = 0$. If g is an arbitrary rotation and $(\nabla^2 + k^2)U = 0$, then $U(gx)$ also solves this equation. Thus,

$$\int_D U(gx)dx = 0, \qquad \forall g. \tag{15}$$

Let g be a rotation about unit vector α by an angle ϕ. Differentiate (15) with respect to ϕ and then let $\phi = 0$. The result is:

$$\int_D \nabla U(x) \cdot [\alpha, x]dx = 0, \qquad \forall \alpha \in S^2. \tag{16}$$

Using the divergence theorem and arbitrariness of $\alpha \in S^2$ one obtains from (16) the relation:

$$\int_S U(s)[s, N]ds = 0. \tag{17}$$

The set $\{U(s)\}$, where $(\nabla^2 + k^2)U = 0$ in the ball $B_a := \{x : |x| \leq a\}$, is the orthogonal complement in $L^2(S)$ of the linear span of the functions $u_{jN}(s)$, where $u_j(x)$, $1 \leq j \leq J$, is a linearly independent set of solutions to problem (6). To check this, denote $f := U(s)$ and let $F \in H^2(D)$ be any function such that $F|_S = f$. Let $U = F + v$. Then $(\nabla^2 + k^2)v = -(\nabla^2 + k^2)F$ in D, $v|_S = 0$. This boundary problem for v is solvable if and only if the orthogonality conditions

$$\int_D (\nabla^2 + k^2)F(x)u_j(x)dx = 0, \qquad 1 \leq j \leq J, \tag{18}$$

hold. Integrating by parts and taking into account that

$$u_j|_S = 0 \quad and \quad F|_S = f,$$

one gets

$$\int_S f(s)u_{jN}(s)ds = 0, \qquad 1 \leq j \leq J. \tag{19}$$

Thus, any function orthogonal in $L^2(S)$ to f, that is, orthogonal to the restriction of U on S, is a linear combination of the functions $u_{jN}(s)$, where the set $\{u_j(x)\}$ is a complete linearly independent set of solutions to (6). Theorem 6 is proved. □

Brief historical comment: the result in [2] was not correct, a counterexample was given in [1]. A bibliography on the Pompeiu problem can be found in [7]– [9] and in [12].

The method used in Theorem 6 was used in other symmetry problems, see [3]-[6]. In [9], p. 406, a description is given of all non-zero solutions to equation (1).

References

[1] L. Chakalov, Sur un probleme de D.Pompeiu, *Godishnik Univ. Sofia, Fac. Phys-Math.,* Livre 1, 40, (1944), 1-14.

[2] D. Pompeiu, Sur une propriete integrale des fonctions de deux variables reelles, *Bull. Sci. Acad. Roy. Belgique,* 5, N 15, (1929), 265-269.

[3] A. G. Ramm, A symmetry problem, *Ann. Polon. Math.,* 92, (2007), 49-54.

[4] A. G. Ramm, N. S. Hoang, Symmetry problems 2, *Ann. Polon. Math.,* 96, N1, (2009), 61-64.

[5] A. G. Ramm, A symmetry problem for strictly convex domains, *Analysis,* 35 (1), (2015), 29-32.

[6] A. G. Ramm, Symmetry problem, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.,* 141, N2, (2013), 515-521.

[7] A. G. Ramm, The Pompeiu problem, *Applicable Analysis,* 64, N1-2, (1997), 19-26.

[8] A. G. Ramm, Necessary and sufficient condition for a domain, which fails to have Pompeiu property, to be a ball, *Journ. of Inverse and Ill-Posed Probl.,* 6, N2, (1998), 165-171.

[9] A. G. Ramm, *Inverse Problems*, Springer, New York, 2005.

[10] A. G. Ramm, The Pompeiu problem, *Global Journ. Math. Anal.,* 1, N1, (2013), 1-10.

open access: http://www.sciencepubco.com/index.php/GJMA/

[11] S. Williams, Analyticity of the boundary for Lipschitz domains without Pompeiu property, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.,* 30, (1981), 357-369.

[12] L. Zalcman, A bibliographical survey of the Pompeiu Problem, in "Approximation by solutions of partial differential equations", (B.Fuglede editor), Kluwer Acad., Dordrecht, 1992, pp. 177-186.